Application No. Applicant(s) 10/735,088 NAGARAJ ET AL. Interview Summary Examiner Art Unit 2165 Apu M. Mofiz All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Noel Kivlin. (2) Apu M. Mofiz. Date of Interview: 07 November 2006. Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1] applicant 2) applicant's representative e)⊠ No. Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description: None. Claim(s) discussed: 1,4,7,8,10,14,18,21,24 and 27. Identification of prior art discussed: None. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant and the Examiner agreed to add the limitations of claim 3 into the independent claims to further clarify the invention claimed. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an

requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature if required